UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/579,256	05/25/2000	Umesh Gopaldas Khatwani	AUS000195US1	7212

35525 7590 11/30/2005

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
SMITH, PETER J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/579,256	KHATWANI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J. Smith	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 September 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-17,19-25,27-37 and 39-70* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-17,19-25,27-37 and 39-70* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: appeal brief filed on 9/13/2005.

2. Claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-25, 27-37, and 39-70 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 13, 32, 47, 48, 53, 60, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, and 70 are independent claims.

3. In view of the appeal brief filed on 9/13/2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 13-16, 19-24, 27-31, 53-55, 57, 58, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Imielinski et al. (hereinafter "Imielinski"), 2002/0013792 A1 provisional application filed 12/30/1999.

Regarding independent claims 13, 53, and 66, Imielinski discloses receiving a first web document in fig. 1 and paragraphs [0036] – [0040]. The first web document is called the original electronic document in Imielinski. Imielinski teaches receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs [0049] – [0054], and [0067]. Imielinski also provides an example in paragraph [0014] that virtual tags, for example, could be used to display text of the original document in a red font on the virtual page. Imielinski discloses creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document wherein the font attribute, within the second web document, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs [0036] – [0040], and paragraphs [0042] – [0048]. In Imielinski the second web document is called the virtual page. The virtual page is the requested

portion of the original electronic document that selected and customized according to the transformation rules generated by the user.

Regarding dependent claims 14 and 54, Imielinski discloses wherein the step of creating the second web document includes inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs [0049] – [0054], and [0067]. Imielinski also provides an example in paragraph [0014] that virtual tags, for example, could be used to display the selected text of the original document in a red font on the virtual page.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Imielinski discloses sending the second web document to an output device in fig. 3 and paragraphs [0042] – [0048].

Regarding dependent claims 16 and 55, Imielinski discloses wherein the output device is a display device in fig. 3 and paragraphs [0042] – [0048]. Imielinski discloses wherein the selected portion is displayed according to the virtual font indicators in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs [0049] – [0054], and [0067].

Regarding dependent claim 19, Imielinski discloses wherein the virtual font indicators include tags in fig. 1-3 and paragraph [0036] – [0048].

Regarding dependent claim 20, Imielinski discloses wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language in paragraphs [0011] and [0015].

Regarding dependent claim 21, Imielinski discloses wherein the virtual font indicators include hypertext markup language tags in fig. 1-3 and paragraph [0036] – [0048].

Regarding dependent claims 22 and 57, Imielinski discloses identifying at least one font indicator associated with text within the selected portion of the first web document, wherein

the step of creating the second web document includes modifying the font attribute of the associated at least one font indicator in fig. 9B and paragraph [0067].

Regarding dependent claim 23, Imielinski discloses sending the second web document to an output device in fig. 3 and paragraphs [0042] – [0048].

Regarding dependent claims 24 and 58, Imielinski discloses wherein the output device is a display device in fig. 3 and paragraphs [0042] – [0048]. Imielinski discloses wherein the selected portion is displayed according to the virtual font indicators in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs [0049] – [0054], and [0067].

Regarding dependent claim 27, Imielinski discloses wherein the at least one font indicator includes a tag in fig. 1-3 and paragraph [0036] – [0048].

Regarding dependent claim 28, Imielinski discloses wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language in paragraphs [0011] and [0015].

Regarding dependent claim 29, Imielinski discloses wherein the at least one font indicator includes a hypertext markup language tag in paragraphs [0011] and [0015].

Regarding dependent claim 30, Imielinski discloses creating a copy of the first web document and changing the font attribute of the selected portion within the copy of the first web document in fig. 9B and paragraph [0067].

Regarding dependent claim 31, Imielinski discloses changing the font attribute of the selected portion within the first web document to create the second web document in fig. 9B and paragraph [0067].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-7, 9-12, 17, 25, 32-37, 39-48, 51, 52, 56, 59-65, and 67-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imielinski et al. (hereinafter "Imielinski"), 2002/0013792 A1 provisional application filed 12/30/1999 in view of Batres, US 6,832,351 B1 filed 10/1/1999.

Regarding independent claims 1, 48, and 65, Imielinski teaches receiving a first web document including formatting information used to display the first web document in fig. 1 and paragraphs [0036] – [0040]. The first web document is called the original electronic document in Imielinski. Imielinski teaches receiving a request to present a selected portion of the first web document in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs [0036] – [0040], and paragraphs [0042] – [0048]. The request and selected portion are defined in the transformation information of Imielinski. Imielinski teaches identifying formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document and creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs [0036] – [0040], and paragraphs [0042] – [0048]. In Imielinski the second web document is called the virtual page. The virtual page is the requested portion of the original electronic document that selected and customized according

to the transformation rules generated by the user. Imielinski teaches responsive to a request to change a font attribute of the selected portion, inserting virtual font indicators before and after text within the selected portion in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs [0049] – [0054], and [0067]. Imielinski also provides an example in paragraph [0014] that virtual tags, for example, could be used to display text of the original document in a red font on the virtual page.

Imielinski does not teach responsive to a request to identify a page break in the selected portion, inserting at least one virtual page break indicator within the selected portion. Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Imielinski teaches sending the second web document to an output device in fig. 3 and paragraphs [0042] – [0048].

Regarding dependent claim 3, Imielinski does not teach wherein the output device is a printer. Batres does wherein the output device is a printer in the abstract, col. 1 line 62 – col. 2 line 9, and col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Imielinski teaches wherein the output device is a display device in fig. 3 and paragraphs [0042] – [0048].

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 51, Imielinski teaches receiving a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of a web document and creating in the web browser a virtual page from the web document, wherein the font attribute, within the virtual page, of the selected portion is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs [0049] – [0054], and [0067]. Imielinski teaches in paragraph [0040] that the transformation rules may be applied to the original electronic document, a second electronic document having a similar structure as the original electronic document, or all future instances of the original electronic document. Therefore, Imielinski teaches that a future instance of the original electronic document is the second web document and the virtual page is then the third web document.

Regarding dependent claims 6 and 52, Imielinski does not teach receiving a request to display page break indicators within a web document, identifying page break information for the web document for an output device, and creating in the web browser a fourth web document from the third web document wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the fourth web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks. Imielinski teaches in paragraph [0040] that the transformation rules may be applied to the original electronic document, a second electronic document having a similar structure as the original electronic document, or all future instances of the original electronic document. Therefore, Imielinski teaches that a future instance of the original electronic document is the third web document and the virtual page is then the fourth web document.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Imielinski does not teach receiving a request to display page break indicators within a web document, identifying page break information for the web document for an output device, and creating in the web browser a fourth web document from the third web document wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the fourth web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks. Imielinski teaches in paragraph [0040] that the transformation rules may be applied to the original electronic document, a second electronic document having a similar structure as the original electronic document, or all future instances of the original electronic document. Therefore, Imielinski teaches that a future instance of the original electronic document is the second web document and the virtual page is then the third web document.

Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Imielinski teaches wherein the formatting information includes tags in fig. 1-3 and paragraph [0036] – [0048].

Regarding dependent claim 10, Imielinski teaches wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language in paragraphs [0011] and [0015].

Regarding dependent claim 11, Imielinski teaches wherein the formatting information includes hypertext markup language tags in paragraphs [0011] and [0015].

Regarding dependent claim 12, Imielinski teaches wherein the formatting information includes a header in [0011] and [0015].

Regarding dependent claims 17 and 56, Imielinski teaches wherein the selected portion is outputted according to the virtual font indicators in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs [0049] – [0054], and [0067]. Imielinski does not teach wherein the output device is a printer. Batres does wherein the output device is a printer in the abstract, col. 1 line 62 – col. 2 line 9, and col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claims 25 and 59, Imielinski teaches wherein the selected portion is outputted according to the virtual font indicators in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs [0049] – [0054], and [0067]. Imielinski does not teach wherein the output device is a printer. Batres does

wherein the output device is a printer in the abstract, col. 1 line 62 – col. 2 line 9, and col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding independent claims 32, 60, and 67, Imielinski teaches receiving a first web document in fig. 1 and paragraphs [0036] – [0040]. The first web document is called the original electronic document in Imielinski. Imielinski teaches creating in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein the first web document and second web document are markup language documents in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs [0036] – [0040], and paragraphs [0042] – [0048]. In Imielinski the second web document is called the virtual page. The virtual page is the requested portion of the original electronic document that selected and customized according to the transformation rules generated by the user.

Imielinski does not teach receiving a request to display page break indicators within the first web document, identifying page break information for the first web document for an output device, and inserting at least one virtual page break indicator into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks. Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4

line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claims 33 and 61, Imielinski does not teach removing the at least one virtual page break indicator and printing the second web document. Batres does teach Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual

page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claims 34 and 62, Imielinski does not teach replacing the at least one virtual page break indicator with at least one forced page break and printing the second web document. Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claims 35 and 63, Imielinski teaches sending the second web document to an output device in fig. 3 and paragraphs [0042] – [0048].

Regarding dependent claim 36, Imielinski does not teach wherein the output device is a printer. Batres does wherein the output device is a printer in the abstract, col. 1 line 62 – col. 2 line 9, and col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and

Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claim 37, Imielinski teaches wherein the output device is a display device in fig. 3 and paragraphs [0042] – [0048].

Regarding dependent claim 39, Imielinski teaches virtual tags for implementing formatting in the second web document in fig. 1-3 and paragraph [0036] – [0048]. Imielinski does not teach a virtual page break indicator. Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claim 40, Imielinski teaches wherein the markup language is hypertext markup language in paragraphs [0011] and [0015].

Regarding dependent claim 41, Imielinski teaches virtual tags for implementing formatting in the second web document in fig. 1-3 and paragraph [0036] – [0048]. Imielinski does not teach a virtual page break indicator. Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claim 42, Imielinski teaches creating a copy of the first web document and inserting at least one virtual tag into the copy of the first web document in fig. 1-3 and paragraph [0036] – [0048]. Imielinski does not teach that the virtual tag is a virtual page break indicator. Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the

HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claim 43, Imielinski teaches inserting at least one virtual tag into the first web document to create a second web document in fig. 1-3 and paragraph [0036] – [0048]. Imielinski does not teach that the virtual tag is a virtual page break indicator. Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual

page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claim 44, Imielinski does not teach sending the first web document to a device driver and receiving page break information corresponding to the first web document form the device driver. Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators via a device driver to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claim 45, Imielinski does not teach wherein the device driver is a printer driver. Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators via a printer driver to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML

format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding dependent claim 46, Imielinski does not teach identifying the location of at least one page break based on page setup information, document formatting information, and document content. Batres does teach identifying the location of at least one page break based on page setup information, document formatting information, and document content in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding independent claims 47, 64, and 68, Imielinski teaches receiving a first web document in fig. 1 and paragraphs [0036] – [0040]. The first web document is called the original electronic document in Imielinski. Imielinski teaches receiving a request to perform an action, wherein the request to perform an action comprises a request to present a selected portion of the first web document in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs [0036] – [0040], and paragraphs [0042] – [0048]. The request and selected portion are defined in the transformation information of Imielinski. Imielinski teaches wherein the request to perform an action comprises a request to change a font attribute of a selected portion of the first web document in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs [0049] – [0054], and [0067]. Imielinski also provides an example in paragraph [0014] that virtual tags, for example, could be used to display text of the original document in a red font on the virtual page. Imielinski teaches creating in the web browser a second web document comprising at least a portion of the first web document in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs [0036] – [0040], and paragraphs [0042] – [0048]. In Imielinski the second web document is called the virtual page. The virtual page is the requested portion of the original electronic document that selected and customized according to the transformation rules generated by the user.

Imielinski does not teach wherein the request to perform an action comprises a request to display page break indicators within the first web document. Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual page break indicators via a printer driver to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can

accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Regarding independent claim 70, Imielinski teaches an interface means for allowing a user to interface with a web browser application and a communication means for receiving a first web document from a network in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs [0036] – [0040], and paragraphs [0042] – [0048]. The first web document is called the original electronic document in Imielinski. Imielinski teaches a creation and editing means with a mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request to present a selected portion of the first web document in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs [0036] – [0040], and paragraphs [0042] – [0048]. The request and selected portion are defined in the transformation information of Imielinski. Imielinski teaches identifying formatting information associated with the selected portion of the first web document and creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, wherein the first web document and the second web document are markup language documents in fig. 1, fig. 3, paragraphs [0036] – [0040], and paragraphs [0042] – [0048]. In Imielinski the second web document is called the virtual page. The virtual page is the requested portion of the

original electronic document that selected and customized according to the transformation rules generated by the user.

Imielinski teaches a creation and editing means with a mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from interface means to change a font attribute of the selected portion of the first web document in fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs [0049] – [0054], and [0067]. Imielinski also provides an example in paragraph [0014] that virtual tags, for example, could be used to display text of the original document in a red font on the virtual page. Imielinski creating in the web browser a second web document including the selected portion and the formatting information associated with the selected portion, in response to receiving the request, wherein the font attribute of the selected portion within the second web document is changed in response to receiving the request to change the font attribute of the selected portion in fig. 1, fig. 3, fig. 4, fig. 9B, paragraphs [0036] – [0040], [0042] – [0054], and [0067]. In Imielinski the second web document is called the virtual page. The virtual page is the requested portion of the original electronic document that selected and customized according to the transformation rules generated by the user.

Imielinski does not teach a creation and editing means with a mode of operation in which the creation and editing means receives a request from the interface means to display page break indicators within the first web document, identifies page break information corresponding to the first web document, and creates in the web browser a second web document from the first web document, wherein at least one virtual page break indicator is inserted into the second web document, in response to the page break information, to indicate the location of page breaks. Batres does teach enhancing a web document by inserting and manipulating one or more virtual

page break indicators to implement pagination for printing preview in fig. 2, fig. 5, col. 2 lines 28-43, col. 4 line 57 – col. 5 line 52, col. 8 lines 20-46. Batres teaches that the HTML preview rendering can accept data manipulation, formatting, and content changes. Batres also teaches that the page breaks are part of the multiple-page HTML format documents as described in col. 8 lines 20-46. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Imielinski and Batres to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the HTML preview rendering as taught by Batres to have improved the virtual page creation and display as taught by Imielinski. The combination would have enabled a user to have further manipulated a virtual page, including page breaks, to have previewed and prepared the document for output to a printing device.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments, see appeal brief, filed 9/13/2005, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-7, 9-17, 19-25, 27-37, and 39-70 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration and search, new grounds of rejection are made in view of newly found prior art references of Imielinski et al. and Batres. Imielinski teaches creating a virtual page or second web document from a first web document using virtual tags. The virtual tags identify the original document content or a selected portion of the original document content for creation of the virtual page. The virtual tags have the ability to manipulate the formatting information, such as font attribute information, in the subsequent web document, called a virtual page by Imielinski. Batres teaches previewing and

printing a web document via an HTML renderer. The content and formatting may be manipulating in the HTML renderer. Batres also defines a multiple-page HTML document, which can demarcate HTML document information among a plurality of pages.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Michelman et al., US 6,128,633 filed 3/25/1997 discloses manipulating page-breaks in an electronic document. Stieren, "SST: Using Single-Sourcing, SGML, and Teamwork for Documentation", Proceedings of the 17th Annual International Conference on Computer Documentation, published by ACM Press, 1999, pages 45-52 discloses a single-source documentation for output in multiple formats.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
11/27/2005

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100